

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 are pending, plus new claims 63-66. There was previously a restriction requirement. Applicant provisionally elected Group I (claims 1-19 and 36-55) without prejudice, but with traverse, for further prosecution. The present Office Action withdraws Group II (claims 20-34) and Group III (claims 56-62) from prosecution.

The previous Office Action (23 May 2006) described independent system claim 35 as a linking claim that links Groups I and II. However, claim 35 is now rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), from *Lidow* (U.S. Patent No. 4,228,806) in view of *Geva* (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0073098).

In Group I, the independent claims are mobile terminal claim 1 and method claim 36. These independent claims are now also rejected as obvious from *Lidow* in view of *Geva*. Claims 1 and 36 (but not 35) are further rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), from *Koyama* (U.S. Patent No. 5,101,831) in view of *Geva*.

The following claims in Group I are indicated to be allowable: 6, 8, 12-13, 37, 42, 44, 45, 48-49, and 54.

The Present Amendments

To expedite prosecution, the claims of Group III are now cancelled without prejudice, and various other claims are cancelled as well.

Also, the limitations of allowed claims 6 and 42 are now amended substantially as suggested at page 2 of the Office Action, and those limitations are now inserted into independent claims 1 and 36 so that claims 6 and 42 are cancelled. Furthermore, allowed claims 44 and 37 are now put in independent form, and claim 54 is made dependent from claim 37.

New claim 63 depends from claim 37, and is fully supported by the specification as originally filed, so there is no new matter. New claims 64 and 65 are means plus function claims corresponding to amended claims 1 and 7. New claim 66 includes limitations of allowed claim 6.

Regarding independent system claim 35 which the Examiner has said is a linking claim, the limitations of allowed claims 37 and 54 are now inserted into claim 35. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the restriction requirement as to Group II be withdrawn, as stated at page 3 of the Office Action dated 23 May 2006. According to MPEP § 809.04:

“If a linking claim is allowed, the examiner must thereafter examine species if the linking claim is generic thereto, or he or she must examine the claims to the nonelected inventions that are linked to the elected invention by such allowed linking claim.”


Thus, further examination appears appropriate, and it is therefore Applicant's understanding that a further non-final Office Action will be forthcoming.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims of the present application define patentable subject matter. Early passage of the pending claims to issue is earnestly solicited.

Applicant would appreciate if the Examiner would please contact Applicant's attorney by telephone, if that might help to speedily dispose of any unresolved issues pertaining to the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew T. Hyman
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 45,858

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, PO Box 224
Monroe CT 06468
Tel: (203) 261-1234
Fax: (203) 261-5676